

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 332

HB 010 558

AUTHOR Ehl, C. C.
TITLE Academic Advising and Counseling: A Computer Assisted Enhancement. AIR Forum Paper 1978.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the annual Association for Institutional Research Forum (18th, Houston, Texas, May 21-25, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Freshmen; *Computer Oriented Programs; *Counseling Programs; *Educational Counseling; *Faculty Advisors; Higher Education; Private Colleges; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Teacher Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS *Bentley College MA

ABSTRACT

The features of a new academic advising program at Bentley College, Massachusetts, are described, and the results of a faculty evaluation of the new program are presented. Incoming freshmen are assigned a faculty adviser, who is also one of their classroom instructors. The adviser is provided advising information for each advisee each semester on a computer-produced profile sheet. Faculty were involved in the planning of the new advising program, and advising case studies are included as an integral component of new faculty orientation sessions. An academic advising handbook was published and distributed. The procedure for analyzing the data obtained from the faculty advising evaluation is described, and analysis of the results are presented. The new academic advising program had a considerable impact on the faculty and the faculty's perception of advising. The mean ranks for a computer-produced profile sheet indicate that faculty find this method more important than advising workshops, the advising handbook, and faculty orientation. A sample profile sheet and explanation of the items and the academic advising questionnaire are included. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED161332



THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper is part of the ERIC Collection of 1978 Association for Institutional Research Forum Papers. All papers in the Collection were recommended for inclusion by the AIR Forum Publications Review Committee.

Robert H. Fenske
Arizona State University
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 010558

ACADEMIC ADVISING AND COUNSELING:
A COMPUTER-ASSISTED ENHANCEMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

C. C. Ehl
Framingham State College

HE 010 558

In contrast to counseling, the literature indicates that advising is more specific. Advising involves the provision of information to the advisee. Having been provided with the information, theoretically the advisee can more easily come to an informed decision pertaining to specific academic matters (Hale).

In an academic setting, however, intrusive counseling is essential. Academic advisers provide information about or explanations of academic subjects, procedures, or regulations (Glennan).

More recently, it has been reported that the computer can facilitate and improve the process of academic advising (Aitken and Conrad; Juola, Winburne, and Whitmore).

That there are aspects of advising that can be automated is a reality especially threatening to those who predict, in an era of increasing human estrangement, that the one-to-one relationship will be totally supplanted by a 'surrogated advising system' - student interacting with machine (Hardee).

Yet, at the University of Denver in a series of unstructured interviews with students, faculty, and administrators, it was found that students and faculty generally viewed the computerized document, the Academic Progress Report, as a tool for humanizing - rather than de-humanizing - the advising process (Aitken and Conrad). It has been reported that at Brigham Young University the on-line computer-assisted advisement system . . . is comprehensive, fast and integrates itself into the people-needs and not vice-versa as is often the situation (Brigham Young University).

Acknowledging that computers can help, advising programs need to be further supplemented to accomplish the advising task. Faculty advisers must be able to (1) read and interpret the graduation requirements of the institution, the degree, the college, and the department, (2) know what courses will meet requirements when no specific course is demanded,

(3) have an accurate record of each advisee's academic accomplishments, (4) make judgements concerning the appropriate courses to fulfill each advisee's particular needs, (5) relate effectively with his advisees and (6) have accurate information concerning a multitude of technicalities in such matters as transfer work, transient approval, correspondence courses, changes in requirements, requirements of graduate schools, registration procedures, etc. (Dressel). To help accomplish this end, many institutions publish a faculty advising manual or handbook.

Moreover, if faculty who do the academic advising are consulted and help to design the advising program at the institution, there is a better chance that the advising program will be geared to their perceived and real needs. Likewise, if the institution has a new faculty orientation program which stresses the advising role of faculty, new faculty should be more easily and more effectively integrated into the institution's advising program.

At Bentley College, Waltham, Massachusetts, a four-year private institution enrolling three thousand full-time students, an institution reputed for its business programs, the adviser's role has these principal components.

1. To assist the student in making course selection choices;
2. To monitor the student's academic program;
3. To safeguard the student from ignorance of course and program prerequisites;
4. To help the student to make informed decisions about academic matters generally;
5. To be an informational resource person;
6. To refer the student to other helping offices: counseling, career planning, study skills, etc.

The author was charged with the implementation and coordination of a revitalized academic advising program for the College. The new program was implemented in phases beginning with the 1976-77 academic year. In planning the advising program with faculty, these program purposes evolved:

1. To create a more favorable climate for student and faculty adviser interchange on all levels;
2. To establish academic advising principles, guidelines and policies that are understood and accepted by all concerned;
3. To demonstrate in a very visible and tangible way the College's concern for each student as an individual;
4. To provide the student with a faculty adviser(s) who can assist him with the myriad of decisions he must make during his freshman and sophomore undergraduate years;
5. To assure that faculty advisers and student-related offices work fully and cooperatively with one another. Such offices include Counseling and Student Development, Career Planning and Placement, and other such offices within the student affairs area.

In short, the College wished to create an academic community that was attentive and supportive of the personal, individual, and academic needs of each student.

To help insure that these purposes would be realized, intrinsic to the program were these six principal design features.

1. Incoming freshmen would be assigned a faculty adviser who was also one of the student's classroom instructors. The faculty adviser would serve the student in an advising capacity through the student's first two years at the College.
2. The planning of the new advising program involved faculty. Faculty participated in the planning process through their attendance at a number of workshops. Matters such as the advising load, needed advising information for each advisee, and the contents of an advising handbook were considered and collaboratively agreed upon.
3. The faculty adviser was provided with data and advising information for each of his or her advisees each semester, on a computer-produced Adviser's Profile Sheet.

4. Advising case studies were included as an integral component of new faculty orientation sessions.
5. An academic advising handbook was published and distributed.
6. A faculty evaluation of the new academic advising program was planned. (See Appendix I).

This paper comments on some of the features of the new program and the results of the faculty questionnaire.

Assigning Faculty Advisees

Students matriculating at Bentley are assigned a core curriculum faculty adviser who is also a classroom instructor for the advisee in his first semester at the College. Since new freshmen and new transfer students are registered before the start of classes in the fall, the assignment process is completed before classes begin. Advisees are informed by letter who their adviser is and his office location. Advisers receive a computer printout listing the names, class, and intended major of all his advisees. In no case are more than thirty advisees assigned to any single adviser. Advisees are free to change advisers if they wish. When the advisee reaches junior class standing, the advising responsibility is shifted to faculty in the student's major department.

Faculty Involvement in Planning the New Advising Program

All faculty who were eligible for advisee assignments, faculty who teach freshmen level courses (approximately 75% of the faculty), were invited to a series of workshops and planning sessions to discuss their perceptions on academic advising at the College. These workshops were underway in 1975-76 and extended through 1976-77.

Adviser's Profile Sheet

With the aid of the College Computer Center Staff, an Advisee Profile Sheet was designed and first distributed to the advising faculty in the fall semester of the 1976-77 academic year (Figures 1 and 2).

FIGURE 1

FEB 22 '78

BENTLEY COLLEGE
ADVISOR'S PROFILE SHEET

74

STUDENT: EDWARD K FLYNN

ID:033-44-8359

MAJOR(S):EF

ADVISOR:7535 EUCHHOLZ, WILLIAM J

CURRENT STATUS:B

(CURRENTLY REGISTERED)

LEGAL ADDRESS:

32 WHITMAN RD., WALTHAM, MA 02154

TEL:617 893-1656

LOCAL ADDRESS:

32 WHITMAN RD., WALTHAM, MA 02154

TEL: 893-1656

PARENT NAME:

MR. & MRS. PAUL FLYNN

PARENT ADDRESS:

40 WHITMAN ROAD, WALTHAM, MA 02154

TEL:617 969-9422

STUDENT TYPE:

PRIOR SCHOOL:221555

QPA:

SAT(HIGHEST)

MATH:460

VERBAL:420

AVERAGES - SEMESTER:2.000 CUMULATIVE:1.928 CLASS:3 PROBATION:0

OUTSTANDING FAILURES

PE101	008	PHYSICAL ED	U
QA121	007	INTRO TO CALC I	F

PREVIOUS SEMESTER GRADES

AC211	001	INTERMED ACCTG I	1.0
EC101	019	PRINC OF ECON I	4.0
EN231	002	AMERICAN LIT I	0.7
PE101	011	PHYSICAL ED	W
PH101	004	PROBLEMS OF PHIL	2.3
QA241	014	STATISTICS I	W

CURRENT SCHEDULE

COURSE	SEC	DESCRIPTION	GRD	INSTRUCTOR	RM	M	T	W	T	F
CS130	006	INTRO COMP & PROG		GRAFFMAN	14	A		B		
EN232	011	AMERICAN LIT II		LARKIN	314			C		C
EC201	004	FIN INSTITUTIONS		FEY	416	B			A	
EC102	004	PRINC OF ECON II		DOODY	313			A		B

Figure 2

Explanation of Items on Adviser Profile Sheet

Major(s): (Dual majors will be indicated)

AC - Accounting	EC - Economics	LA - Liberal Arts
BC - Business Communications	EF - Economics and Finance	MG - Management
BE - Business Education	GB - General Business	MK - Marketing
CS - Computer Systems	IB - International Business	QA - Quantitative Analysis Mgmt.

Current Status:

- A - Student registered last semester; not registered this semester
- B - Student registered last semester and also registered this semester
- C - Admitted new student; not yet registered this semester
- D - Admitted new student and also registered this semester
- Z - Unreported withdrawal (cancellation)

Student Type:

- F - Freshman; F Code reverts to no code at all (Blank) when student is enrolled in his second Bentley semester.
- T - Transfer student; permanent code unless student subsequently returns, is readmitted, or changes division. The readmitted, returning, and change of division codes override in such instances.
- X - Division change; student transfers from evening to day.
- R - Readmitted; student authorized to register after having been suspended for either disciplinary or academic reasons. - A permanent code.
- Y - Returning; student authorized to register after having interrupted his studies for a semester or more.

QPA:

Quality point average at prior school or institution. Planned for the future but not available currently.

Averages:

Semester - Totals of credit course grade points multiplied by semester divided by credit semester hours attempted.

Cumulative - Same - Total history of student at Bentley.

Class:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (1) 0-4 Courses Completed | (4) 15-19 Courses Completed | (7) 30-34 Courses Completed |
| (2) 5-9 Courses Completed | (5) 20-24 Courses Completed | (8) 35-40 Courses Completed |
| (3) 10-14 Courses Completed | (6) 25-29 Courses Completed | |

Probation:

1. First semester on probation
2. Second consecutive semester on probation. Semester average meets class requirement (Freshmen 1.7, Sophomore 1.9, Junior-Senior 2.0). Cumulative average does not meet class requirement.
3. Student is candidate for dismissal.

The Profile Sheet provides the instructor with up-to-date demographic and academic information on each advisee. It features a cumulative printout of unresolved course deficiencies, failures and incompletes; the enrolled courses and grades of the student from the previous semester; and the student's current course schedule including the names of his present instructors. The Profile Sheet also identifies for the adviser which of his advisees withdrew, changed major, and/or were academically suspended, etc. Additionally, the current semester average, the updated cumulative average, and the student's probationary standing are provided.

New Faculty Orientation

For some years the College has conducted an orientation for new faculty. Given the renewed emphasis on advising at Bentley, it was a natural outgrowth to merge the new advising program and the faculty orientation program to include faculty advising case studies as a component of faculty orientation.

Academic Advising Handbook

In any complex institution, the number of policies, procedures, and guidelines confronting the adviser and advisee "can boggle the mind." An academic Advising Handbook was published and distributed to faculty during the fall semester of 1977-78 academic year to inform the advising faculty of the chief policies, procedures and guidelines that obtain at the College.

Evaluation

In early 1978 a questionnaire was distributed to the ninety-nine core curriculum advising faculty at the College. The faculty were asked to evaluate the new advising program with regard to its purposes, the role awareness of the faculty, future computer reports planned for advisers and other matters.

Useable responses were received from sixty-six of the ninety-nine faculty (66.6 percent).

Procedure

To analyze the data in the faculty advising evaluation, the mean rank for each objective survey question was calculated by (1) assigning weights to each possible response, (2) summing the weights of all responses, and (3) calculating a mean rank for each question by dividing the total weights by the number of faculty responding to the question. A Percentile Frequency Distribution and Mean Rank Table (Table 1) was assembled for the whole faculty. Because questions (1.1), (2.1), and (5.3) were exclusively intended for faculty who had been at the College for more than two years, results to these questions are also included in a separate Adjusted Percentile Frequency Distribution and Mean Rank Table (Table 1a).

Subgroups were established by discipline (Table 2), by academic rank (Table 3), by number of assigned advisees (Table 4), by faculty building location (Table 5), and by years of teaching at the College (Table 6). These subgroup results were generally described.

The major subgroup mean rank differences were compared two at a time using the Scheffé Multi-Comparison Method. Because the Scheffé procedure is more rigorous than other procedures, investigators may choose to employ a less rigorous significance level, the 0.10 level instead of the 0.05 level (Ferguson). The 0.10 level was employed in some instances in analyzing the results of the faculty questionnaire.

TABLE 1
PERCENTILES AND MEAN RANKS OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS

n = 66

Survey Question	NR	Percentiles				Mean Rank
		1	2	3	4	
1.1	40.9	1.5	9.1	39.4	9.1	2.95
1.2	10.6	4.5	40.9	34.8	9.1	2.54
1.3	9.1	1.5	7.6	40.9	40.9	3.33
1.4	6.1	0.0	6.1	33.3	54.5	3.52
1.5	15.2	0.0	9.1	37.9	37.9	3.34
1.6	15.2	0.0	16.7	37.9	30.3	3.16
2.1	42.4	16.7	19.7	21.2	-	2.08
2.2	7.6	1.5	10.6	47.0	33.3	3.21
2.3	12.1	16.7	40.9	30.3	-	2.16
3.1	4.5	0.0	13.6	27.3	54.5	3.43
3.2	6.1	3.0	39.4	51.5	-	2.52
3.3	3.0	31.8	59.1	6.1	-	1.73
4.1	6.1	10.6	18.2	65.2	-	2.58
4.2	6.1	13.6	21.2	59.1	-	2.48
5.1	4.5	1.5	1.5	30.3	62.1	3.60
5.2	3.0	3.0	39.4	40.9	13.6	2.67
5.3	48.5	4.5	42.4	4.5	-	2.00
FO	12.1	25.8	13.6	19.7	28.8	2.59
HD	12.1	15.2	21.2	33.3	18.2	2.62
APS	12.1	18.2	15.2	16.7	37.9	2.84
AW	12.1	15.2	33.3	15.8	13.6	2.43

NR = No Response
FO = Faculty orientation

HD = Handbook
APS = Adviser's Profile Sheet

AW = Advising workshops

Table 1 Commentary

1. Of the responding faculty, 40.9 percent felt "yes, very much so", the new advising program demonstrated the College's concern for each student as an individual in a tangible way (1.3). Additionally, 81.8 percent responded with "somewhat" or "yes, very much so" to the question (1.3).

2. With regard to the Handbook (1.4), faculty orientation (1.5), advising workshops (1.6), and the Adviser's Profile Sheet (3.1), 87.8 percent, 75.8 percent, 68.2 percent, and 81.8 percent respectively responded either "somewhat" or "yes, very much so" when asked to assess these features of the program as contributing positively to increasing the faculty's awareness of the College's concern for the student as an individual.

3. With regard to developing the other computer-assisted enhancements, 83.4 percent and 80.3 percent of the faculty respectively indicated that a computer-produced degree audit check-list and a transcript facsimile would either be of some help or very helpful (4.1 and 4.2).

4. In assigning advisees to advisers who are also classroom instructors, 92.4 percent of the faculty responded that such assignments either "improved somewhat" or "very much facilitated" the opportunity to establish an earlier and better initial contact with the advisee (5.1).

5. Only 51.5 percent of the faculty really study the Adviser's Profile Sheet (3.2) and only 6.1 percent use them as the basis to frequently initiate an advisee contact (3.3). On the other hand, 65.2 percent use the sheets to initiate a contact with students either on occasion or frequently (3.3).

6. When asked to compare the impact of faculty orientation, the Advising Handbook, the Advising Profile Sheet, and the workshops, the faculty rank the Advising Profile Sheet highest with a mean rank of 2.84 followed by the Advising Handbook (2.62), faculty orientation (2.59), and the workshops (2.43).

TABLE 1a

PERCENTILES AND MEAN RANKS OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS
AT THE COLLEGE MORE THAN TWO YEARS

n = 39

Survey Question	A d j u s t e d P e r c e n t i l e s				Mean Rank
	1	2	3	4	
1.1	2.6	15.3	66.6	15.3	2.95
2.1	28.9	34.2	36.8	-	2.08
5.3	8.8	82.4	8.8	-	2.00

Table 1a Commentary

1. Of faculty who advised in both the old and new advising programs, 81.9 percent felt the new program "improved" or "substantially improved" the climate for advising at the College (1.1).
2. Notwithstanding, the faculty are only "somewhat" more conscious of their advising role, 2.08 mean rank, (2.1).
3. When asked their perceptions of how students feel about the new advising program, 82.4 percent of the faculty indicated that students don't take advising seriously, but they recognize the College's attempts to improve it (5.3).

TABLE 2
MEAN RATING OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS BY DISCIPLINE

Survey Question	Social Science n = 19	Humanities n = 20	Business n = 11	Math/Science n = 16	Total
1.1	3.00	3.14	2.50	2.50	2.95
1.2	2.55	2.63	2.40	2.33	2.54
1.3	3.58	3.15	3.33	3.15	3.33
1.4	3.42	3.52	3.64	3.53	3.52
1.5	3.28	3.27	3.40	3.43	3.34
1.6	3.13	3.26	3.13	3.08	3.16
2.1	2.15	2.00	2.00	2.11	2.08
2.2	3.42	3.47	3.30	2.79	3.21
2.3	2.16	2.83	2.38	1.84	2.16
3.1	3.42	3.26	3.50	3.60	3.43
3.2	2.53	2.41	2.60	2.56	2.52
3.3	1.90	1.58	1.90	1.63	1.73
4.1	2.71	2.58	2.60	2.40	2.58
4.2	2.66	2.37	2.70	2.26	2.48
5.1	3.66	3.58	3.40	3.69	3.60
5.2	2.76	2.79	2.70	2.62	2.67
5.3	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
FO	2.68	2.63	2.80	2.33	2.59
HD	2.50	2.69	2.40	2.85	2.62
APS	2.77	2.25	3.30	3.29	2.84
AW	2.71	2.47	2.10	2.13	2.43

FO = Faculty orientation
HD = Handbook

AW = Advising workshops
APS = Adviser's Profile Sheet

Table 2 Commentary

1. Although combined means were not statistically tested for significance, it appears that faculty from the social sciences and the humanities (1) attribute the new advising program as improving the advising climate more than faculty from the business and math/science disciplines (1.1), (2) rate the advising climate at the College higher than their colleagues in the business and math/science areas (1.2) and (3) consider faculty advising a more important responsibility generally (2.2).
2. On the other hand, the business and math/science faculty place more emphasis on faculty orientation than do the social sciences and the humanities faculty (1.5).
3. The humanities faculty see the new advising program as helping them to be more aware and conscious of advising as a prime faculty responsibility (2.3). When the Humanities mean rank of 2.83 was compared to the Math/Science mean rank of 1.84 (2.3), the difference was significant at the 0.05 level. When the Humanities mean rank of 2.25 was compared to the Business mean rank of 3.30 (APS), the difference between the means was not significant.

TABLE 3
MEAN RATING OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS BY RANK

Survey Question	Prof. n = 10	Assoc. Prof. n = 8	Ass't. Prof. n = 20	Instructor n = 14	Adjunct n = 14	Total
1.1	3.00	3.13	2.80	3.00	2.86	2.95
1.2	2.89	2.50	2.32	2.18	2.83	2.54
1.3	3.44	3.30	3.00	3.17	3.69	3.33
1.4	3.33	3.63	3.32	3.54	3.85	3.52
1.5	3.13	3.30	3.28	3.36	3.58	3.34
1.6	3.13	3.00	3.22	3.30	3.36	3.16
2.1	1.75	2.00	2.40	2.50	1.88	2.08
2.2	3.11	3.25	3.28	3.08	3.14	3.21
2.3	2.00	1.88	2.24	2.00	2.46	2.16
3.1	3.20	3.50	3.40	3.50	3.54	3.43
3.2	2.44	2.29	2.50	2.75	2.50	2.52
3.3	1.60	2.00	1.65	1.92	1.64	1.73
4.1	2.80	2.38	2.37	2.66	2.77	2.58
4.2	2.60	2.86	2.40	2.25	2.54	2.48
5.1	3.80	3.50	3.42	3.75	3.64	3.60
5.2	3.20	2.88	2.35	2.58	2.71	2.67
5.3	2.13	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.83	2.00
FO	2.67	2.75	1.94	2.82	3.17	2.59
HD	2.78	2.13	2.94	1.81	3.08	2.62
APS	2.56	2.25	3.28	3.18	2.50	2.84
AW	2.60	2.88	2.22	2.45	2.28	2.43

FO = Faculty orientation
HD = Handbook

AW = Advising workshops
APS = Adviser's Profile Sheet

Table 3 Commentary

1. As one proceeds up the full-time academic ranks, instructor through professor, the mean ranks in response to (1.2) also increase, which may indicate that the senior academic ranks assess the present academic advising climate higher than the junior academic-ranked faculty.
2. Conversely, the junior faculty tend to be more conscious of their advising role today than are the senior faculty (2.1). However, when the mean rank for professors (1.75) was compared to the mean rank for instructors (2.50), the difference was not significant.
3. The senior faculty appear to be more informed about the College's academic policies and their interpretation than are the junior and adjunct faculty (5.2). When the mean rank for professors (3.20) was compared to the mean rank for assistant professors (2.35), the difference was found to be significant at the 0.10 level.
4. When the mean ranks of (1) adjunct faculty and assistant professor-ranked faculty were compared and (2) when the mean ranks of instructor-ranked faculty and assistant professor-ranked faculty were compared (F0), the differences were not significant.
5. When the mean ranks of (1) adjunct faculty and ~~assistant professor~~^{instructor}-ranked faculty were compared and (2) when the mean ranks of instructor-ranked faculty and assistant professor-ranked faculty were compared (HD), the differences were significant at the 0.05 level.
6. When the mean rank of assistant professors was compared to the mean rank for associate professors (APS), the difference was not significant.

TABLE 4
MEAN RATING OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS
BY NUMBER OF ASSIGNED ADVISEES

Survey Question	5 - 10 Advisees n = 12	11 - 20 Advisees n = 24	21 - 30 Advisees n = 26	Total
1.1	2.38	3.00	3.00	2.95
1.2	2.67	2.50	2.54	2.54
1.3	3.44	3.27	3.32	3.33
1.4	3.78	3.46	3.44	3.52
1.5	3.63	3.25	3.32	3.34
1.6	3.22	3.09	3.14	3.16
2.1	1.78	2.38	1.93	2.08
2.2	2.70	3.29	3.33	3.21
2.3	2.22	2.26	2.09	2.16
3.1	3.64	3.38	3.36	3.43
3.2	2.33	2.52	2.58	2.52
3.3	1.58	1.63	1.88	1.73
4.1	2.64	2.67	2.42	2.58
4.2	2.18	2.50	2.48	2.48
5.1	3.55	3.85	3.68	3.60
5.2	2.75	2.54	2.80	2.67
5.3	1.88	2.08	1.92	2.00
FO	2.00	2.50	2.56	2.59
HD	3.09	2.77	2.30	2.62
APS	2.45	2.77	3.00	2.84
AW	2.45	2.32	2.46	2.43

FO = Faculty orientation
HD = Handbook

AW = Advising workshops
APD = Adviser's Profile Sheet

Table 4 Commentary

1. As might be expected, faculty respondents rated academic advising progressively more important as their advising load increased (2.2). Indeed, when the mean rank of advisers with 21-30 advisees and advisers with 11-20 advisees were compared individually to the mean rank of advisers with 5-10 advisees, the differences were significant at the 0.10 level.
2. When advisers with 5-10 advisees were compared to advisers with 21-30 advisees in their rating of the advising handbook (HD), the difference was significant at the 0.10 level.

TABLE 5
MEAN RATING OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS
BY BUILDING LOCATION

Survey Question	F/A n = 41	E n = 22	Other n = 3	Total
1.1	3.00	2.90	2.50	2.95
1.2	2.61	2.42	2.50	2.54
1.3	3.30	3.35	3.75	3.33
1.4	3.46	3.60	3.75	3.52
1.5	3.31	3.35	3.75	3.34
1.6	3.14	3.18	3.50	3.16
2.1	2.12	1.91	3.00	2.08
2.2	3.32	3.14	2.33	3.21
2.3	2.17	2.15	2.00	2.16
3.1	3.50	3.40	3.67	3.43
3.2	2.47	2.62	2.33	2.52
3.3	1.75	1.76	1.33	1.73
4.1	2.54	2.65	2.33	2.58
4.2	2.59	2.30	2.33	2.48
5.1	3.58	3.65	3.67	3.60
5.2	2.75	2.26	2.00	2.67
5.3	2.08	1.75	2.00	2.00
FO	2.41	2.89	3.00	2.59
HD	2.76	2.32	3.00	2.62
APS	2.86	2.78	3.00	2.84
AW	2.47	2.33	2.50	2.43

FO = Faculty orientation
HD = Handbook

AW = Advising workshops
APS = Adviser's Profile Sheet

Table 5 Commentary

Because faculty are quartered principally in two buildings on the Bentley College campus, one building near the center of campus activities and the other not, it was thought that faculty responses to the survey would perhaps differ dependent on the faculty member's office location. The mean ranks depicted in Table 5 do not appear to confirm this assumption.

TABLE 6
MEAN RATING OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS
BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT THE COLLEGE

Survey Question	Two or Less Years n = 23	Three or More Years n = 40	Total
1.1	-	2.95	2.95
1.2	2.59	2.51	2.54
1.3	3.18	3.40	3.33
1.4	3.52	3.53	3.52
1.5	3.52	3.25	3.34
1.6	3.26	3.17	3.16
2.1	-	2.08	2.08
2.2	3.23	3.22	3.21
2.3	2.33	2.12	2.16
3.1	3.30	3.51	3.43
3.2	2.48	2.56	2.52
3.3	1.65	1.82	1.73
4.1	2.78	2.42	2.58
4.2	2.35	2.53	2.48
5.1	3.65	3.62	3.60
5.2	2.56	2.76	2.67
5.3	-	2.00	2.00
FO	2.75	2.54	2.59
HD	2.62	2.57	2.62
APS	3.10	2.66	2.84
AW	1.95	2.72	2.43

FO = Faculty orientation
HD = Handbook

AW = Advising workshops
APS = Adviser's Profile Sheet

Table 6 Commentary

1. Teaching experience at the College does not appear to be a significant variable that affects the faculty member's reactions to the survey, with one exception. When the mean rank of faculty with three or more years teaching experience at the College was compared to the mean rank of faculty with two or less years of teaching experience at the College (AW), the difference was significant at the 0.01 level.
2. In comparing the mean ranks of the two subgroups of the faculty (APS), the difference was not found to be significant.

Summary

The new academic advising program at Bentley College has had a considerable impact on the faculty and the faculty's perception of advising at the College. For certain evaluation questions significant differences at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level were found when the faculty was subgrouped by discipline, academic rank, number of assigned advisees and years of teaching experience at the College. The mean ranks for a computer-produced Adviser's Profile Sheet indicate that faculty do find computer-assisted advising enhancements more important than advising workshops, the College's Advising Handbook, and faculty orientation.

References

- Aitken, C. E. and Conrad, C. F. Improving academic advising through computerization. College and University, Fall, 1977, 53, 115-123.
- _____. Computer assisted advisement at Brigham Young University. College and University, Summer, 1976, 51, 522-624.
- Dressel, F. B. The faculty adviser. Improving College and University Teaching, Winter, 1974, 22, 56-58.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Glennen, R. E. Intrusive college counseling. The School Counselor, Summer, 1976, 24, 48-50.
- Hale, L. L. . . . A bold, new blueprint for career planning and placement. Journal of College Placement, December, 1973, 34, 34-40.
- Hardee, M. D. Faculty advising in colleges and universities, (Student personnel series no. 9). Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1970.
- Juola, A. E., Winburne, J. W., and Whitmore, A. Computer assisted academic advising. Personnel and Guidance Journal, October, 1968, 47, 146-150.

APPENDIX I

Academic Advising Questionnaire

(Respondents were asked to provide their name, department affiliation, rank, number of advisees, office location, and years teaching.)

1. PURPOSES OF BENTLEY'S ADVISING PROGRAM

- 1.1 (Answer only if you have been at Bentley more than 2 years.)
Do you think that the new academic advising program has improved the climate for advising?
- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| (1) made more awkward | (3) improved |
| (2) not affected | (4) substantially improved |
- 1.2 As you assess the academic advising climate at Bentley now, would you rate it...
- | | |
|----------|---------------|
| (1) poor | (3) good |
| (2) fair | (4) excellent |
- 1.3 Do you think the new advising program demonstrates the College's concern for each student as an individual in a tangible way?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| (1) negative effect | (3) somewhat |
| (2) little, if no effect | (4) yes, very much so |
- 1.4 Do you think the Faculty Advising Handbook contributes positively to increasing your awareness of the College's concern for the student as an individual?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| (1) negative effect | (3) somewhat |
| (2) little, if no effect | (4) yes, very much so |
- 1.5 Do you think that Faculty Orientation contributes positively to increasing your awareness of the College's concern for the student as an individual?
- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| (1) negative effect | (3) somewhat |
| (2) little, if no effect | (4) very much so |
- 1.6 Do you think that Faculty Advising Workshops contribute positively to increasing your awareness of the College's concern for the student as an individual?
- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| (1) negative effect | (3) somewhat |
| (2) little, if no effect | (4) very much so |

2. ROLE AWARENESS

- 2.1 (Answer only if you have been at Bentley more than 2 years.)
Are you more conscious of your faculty advising role today as compared to two years ago?
- | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------|
| (1) no | (2) somewhat | (3) very much so |
|--------|--------------|------------------|
- 2.2 How do you rate your academic advising generally?
- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| (1) no importance at all | (3) important |
| (2) of little importance | (4) very important |
- 2.3 Do you feel that the new advising program has helped to make you more aware and conscious of advising as a prime faculty responsibility?
- | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| (1) had no effect | (2) somewhat more aware | (3) much more aware |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|

3. ADVISER PROFILE SHEET

3.1 Do you think the Adviser's Profile Sheet contributes positively to increasing your awareness of the College's concern for the student as an individual?

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| (1) negative effect | (3) somewhat |
| (2) little, if no effect | (4) very much so |

3.2 With specific regard to the Adviser's Profile Sheet, how do you use them?

- (1) really don't use them - shelf-file them
- (2) scan or read them casually
- (3) study them

3.3 Has the information provided to you on the Profile Sheet ever prompted you to go out of your way to initiate a contact with any one of your advisees?

- | | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| (1) no | (2) on occasion | (3) frequently |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|

4. COMPUTER-ASSISTED ENHANCEMENTS

4.1 Would you use and find helpful a computer-assisted Degree Requirement Summary Sheet for each of your student advisees, if it were distributed to you each semester?

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| (1) would not make a difference | (2) of some help | (3) very helpful |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|

4.2 Would you use and find helpful a Transcript Facsimile for each of your student advisees, if it were distributed to you each semester?

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| (1) would not make a difference | (2) of some help | (3) very helpful |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|

5. OTHER

5.1 By assigning advisees who are also students in your classroom in their first semester at Bentley, do you feel that the means to establish an early and better initial contact with your student advisees has been.....

- (1) so structured that it is more awkward
- (2) had no effect
- (3) improved somewhat
- (4) very much facilitated

5.2 How informed do you feel about College academic policies and their interpretation?

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| (1) in the dark | (3) informed enough |
| (2) know where to find answers, but really don't know | (4) very informed |

5.3 (Answer only if you have been teaching at Bentley for more than 2 years.)
How do you feel students perceive the advising program today?

- (1) they don't see any difference at all
- (2) they don't take it seriously, but recognize the College's attempts to improve it
- (3) they take it seriously